DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 480 230 HE 036 241

AUTHOR	Fields, Lynette; Lee, Ann M.
TITLE	The Process of Analyzing and Evaluating a College of Education Curriculum Course.
PUB DATE	2000-06-00
NOTE	37p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Course Content; *Curriculum Development; Educational Change; Undergraduate Students; *Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to analyze an undergraduate curriculum course that was a required component of the core program of the College of Education. Each year several faculty members of the Department of Educational Leadership taught the course in 50 sections. Over the years, the changes by various faculty members resulted in wide variations of content, methods, strategies, and materials. The goal of this study was to analyze and evaluate all elements of the course to make recommendations for changes that would be consistent for all sections and faculty members. Methods focused on a strong triangulation to examine all elements of the undergraduate curriculum course. Surveys, oral and written interviews, and analysis of content material were used to produce more than 20,000 pieces of data. Recommendations were made to the department for changes in course goals, objectives, and content. Final changes will be adopted by the department as a whole. (Contains 5 tables and 30 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 480 230

The Process of Analyzing and Evaluating

A College of Education Curriculum Course

By

Lynette Fields, Ed. D. and Ann M. Lee, Ph. D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Fields

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to analyze an undergraduate curriculum course that was a required component of the core program of the College of Education. Each year several faculty members of the Department of Educational Leadership taught the course in fifty sections. Over the years, the changes by various faculty members resulted in wide variations of content, methods, strategies, and materials. The goal of this study was to analyze and evaluate all elements of the course and make recommendations for changes that would be consistent for all sections taught by the various members of the faculty.

The content of college courses is frequently modified, revised, altered, or changed by individual teaching faculty or on the department level. Many of these changes are a reaction to current research, revised standards of the state or a accrediting organization. Too often a top down approach is used. The current content of the course is not analyzed with regard to content, the faculty, students, experts, or the school where the future teachers will be teaching.

The methods used in this study focused on a strong triangulation that would examine all elements of the undergraduate curriculum course. Surveys, oral and written interviews, and analysis of content of materials were evaluated to produce over 20,000 pieces of data. Recommendations were made to the department for changes in the course goals, objectives, and content. Final changes will be made by the department as a whole.

This method of course analysis and evaluation provides an in depth review of all elements. Differences emerged from the students, school districts, and the college faculty. Identifying these elements will lead to a course that serves the future teachers better.

I. Purpose of Study

The purpose of the study is to analyze and evaluate the content and methodology of EDG 4620, undergraduate Curriculum and Instruction. The outcome of this study includes a report of the findings and recommendations to the Leadership Development Department.

II. History of EDG 4620 Curriculum and Instruction

Curriculum and Instruction has been a course of the University of South Florida College of Education since its founding in 1956. The original Curriculum and Instruction course was numbered EDC 401 consisting of four credit hours with a pre-internship requirement and was taught by the faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership. EDC 401 was a requirement for all education majors. About fifteen years ago the faculty of the department voted to increase the core courses to include: Psychological Foundation, Social Foundation, Measurement, Mainstreaming, Computers in Education, and Curriculum and Instruction. The Curriculum and Instruction course was assigned the EDG 4620 number. The course was placed in the College of Education sequence at the final semester before the students' full semester of internship.

With the establishment of the core courses, the entire faculty approved a policy stating that each core course would have several common elements. These requirements included a common set of objectives for all sections of a course and a "common final examination." Sixty percent of the exam was based on common elements and would count for forty percent of the student's grade. Dr. Dan Purdom, Curriculum Coordinator, (1998) wrote, "Since faculty supplemented the common items, and exams varied from faculty to faculty, our department requested each instructor be assigned a location at which all of his/her students would gather to take the examination developed by that instructor." Permission was granted.

The teaching faculty for EDG 4620 were committed to an emphasis on the connection between the **ends** and the **means** of schooling. Dr. Dan Purdom (1998) reported:

> "Faculty also discussed that the instructional emphasis in the course would not be teaching techniques but broad instructional principles that are generic to a wide range of subject matter areas and levels of schooling. Since there are methods courses in various college programs (e.g. Teaching Methods in the Elementary School), EDG 4620 was to focus on broad principles and strategies rather than specific methods and techniques."

Several changes regarding EDG 4620 occurred over time. The Physical Education Department requested that one of their faculty member's team teach EDG 4620 with a faculty member from Educational Leadership. After a few years, the Physical Education department requested and was granted permission to teach Curriculum and Instruction within that department under a new course number. Also, when the program for Early Childhood Education was developed and approved, EDG 4620 was omitted from the course requirements. Recently, the Department of Special Education requested and was granted permission to drop EDG 4620 from their requirements.

In addition, other changes occurred at the request of Elementary Education. The number of credit hours was reduced from four to three. The pre-internship requirement of six hours per week in a school was dropped. Dr. Purdom (1998) noted:

> "Based on input from both students and faculty in the elementary program, the course was moved to the first semester of that program so students could use it as a foundation course and apply the content to other courses and their field experiences. Programs other than elementary education do not specify a particular sequence for the course and therefore sections with secondary majors, etc. have students taking the course at different stages of their programs."

In December of 1993, Dr. Karen Hosack-Curlin organized the teaching faculty for an informal discussion of the content of EDG 4620: Curriculum and Instruction. They assembled a list of topics, and Dr. Hosack-Curlin created a survey asking all EDG 4620 faculty/instructors to identify their "Top Ten Priorities." Of the twelve surveys distributed, five were returned. Dr. Dan Purdom clustered the topics into six major content areas. Subsequently, Dr. Purdom used this list to develop the Departmental Course Syllabus as required by the College of Education through the Undergraduate and Masters Program Committee (UMPC).

In the Departmental Course Syllabus, Dr. Purdom (1998) established the following:

Course Description:

The course is primarily concerned with helping students to examine judgments regarding the educational purposes and instructional approaches. Emphasis is placed on understanding the connection between **what** is taught and **how** it is taught. Different conceptions of curriculum and the implications these conceptions have for curricular decision-making are explored. Students are expected to apply knowledge of instructional principles and strategies consistent with alternative curricular designs.

Course Goals:

(A) Students will develop an attitude of skeptical reflection when considering proposals and issues relative to curriculum and instruction.

(B) Students will think critically about the curriculum and instruction of schools in relation to the broader purposes of schooling within a democratic and pluralistic society.

(C) Students will develop knowledge of key concepts, principles, and issues in the field of curriculum and instruction.

(D) Students will develop knowledge of curricular and instructional alternatives and understand how differences in values and belief are related to alternative approaches to schooling.

(E) Students will develop skills that are necessary for planning, presenting, and evaluating curriculum.

(F) Students will evaluate their own approach to curriculum and instruction and be interested in exploring other possibilities.

Specific Course Objectives and Related Course Goals (indicated by a letter):

The student will:

1. be able to describe several ways of defining the concept of curriculum. (C)
2. be able to distinguish the formal, informal, and hidden curriculum (C)
3. be able to identify instances of the formal, informal, and hidden curricula in a given situation (B,C)
4. be aware of the hidden curriculum in his/her own teaching situation (B,F)
5. be able to identify goals stated for schooling in a democratic society. (B)
6. be able to describe discrepancies between stated goals and actual practices of schooling. (B)
7. be able to compare and critique varying conceptions of curriculum and identify issues, policies, and practices that are associated with each conceptions. (B,D)
8. be able to determine relationships among values, goals and practices for different conceptions. (D)
9. be able to determine the predominant conception or combination of conceptions inherent in a curriculum (D)
10. clarify and extend her/his own conception of curriculum and instruction. (B, F)
11. be able to describe how curriculum deals with "power." (B,C)
12. be able to identify arguments for and against pluralizing the content of the curriculum. (B, C)
13. be able to explain the relationship between the academic disciplines and interdisciplinary knowledge
14. be able to distinguish among four forms of knowledge commonly found in curriculum. (C, E)
15. be able to apply knowledge of effective teaching practices related to different forms of knowledge when planning and presenting lessons. (E)
16. be able to state educational objectives in behavioral terms. (C, E)
17. be able to apply knowledge of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives to the formulation and classification of educational objectives. (C, E)
18. be able to devise an effective teaching strategy based upon a model of direct instruction. (E,F)
19. be able to devise an effective strategy based upon a student participation, interdisciplinary, thematic approach to instruction. (D, E, F)
20. be able to evaluate instructional strategies in relation to conflicting conceptions of curriculum. (A, B, D)
21. be able to contrast traditional and reform strategies of curricular policy-making. (B)
22. be aware of the need to restructure schools. (B)
23. be able to identify major instructional changes supported by those educators advocating school reform. (A, D)
24. be able to relate proposals to restructure schools to different conceptions of curriculum. (A, B, D)

The six content areas common to all sections of EDG 4620 are: (Purdom, 1998)

1. **Definitions of Curriculum**
   --many different types of curricula (official, hidden, operational, tested, etc.)

2. **Conceptions of Curriculum**
   --different philosophical orientations that influence the plan or approach to schooling

3. **The Purposes of Schooling**
   --aims, goals, and objectives set for schooling and classrooms

4. **The Content of the Curriculum**
   --the nature and presentation of knowledge (especially Domain 4.0 of the Florida Performance Measurement System for Beginning Teachers)

5. **Instructional Strategies**
   --principles of instruction, different instructional models (direct instruction, thematic/integrated instruction, etc.)

6. **The Governance of Schooling**
   --the politics of curriculum making, reform efforts, etc.

By 2000, fifty sections of EDG 4620 were being taught by ten faculty on four campuses—Tampa, St. Petersburg, Lakeland, and Sarasota. The students enrolled in these classes lived in thirteen different school (in Florida, each school district is the same as a county) districts.

III. Review of the Literature

The difficulty of defining the term "curriculum" creates a problem for any attempt to analyze this field of education. Only Webster's Dictionary (1996) offers a definition that is agreeable to most educators. It states, "Curriculum, from a Latin term, literally means running a course." Oliva (1997) writes, "The quest for a definition of curriculum has taxed many an educator (page 2)." Agreeing with this observation, Parkay and Stanford (1998) note, "Curriculum theorists and researchers have suggested several different definitions for **curriculum**, with no one definition universally accepted (p. 346)." For the purposes of this study, no further clarification of the term "curriculum" was attempted.

The review of the literature began with an ERIC search using the key words "teacher education," "subject, " and "curriculum." The search yielded 888 hits. Many of the entries did not address pre-service teachers. A second search was

conducted using the keywords, "teacher knowledge," "undergraduate," and "curriculum development." This time forty-one hits resulted. A third search using the keyword, "curriculum planning," "pre-service education," and "knowledge base" produced fifteen hits. Bibliographies and other references were consulted also.

The history of curriculum is a standard topic at the beginning of many curriculum texts. Tanner and Tanner (1990) wrote the whole story and focused on the traditional aspects of curriculum. Wiles (1999) simply offers a list of "Dates of Historical Significance." Tyler (1981) prepared a concise review, "Curriculum Development Since 1900." Other examples are plentiful and can be consulted easily.

Curriculum theory appears consistently as a core component of the knowledge base for teacher education (Tibbles, et al (1991); Bauer (1990). Topics include the importance of models, adaptations to needs of the diverse student populations, and integration of subjects. Increasingly, emphasis is placed on field-based experiences, ethics/moral education, planing, post modernism, and standards.

Many curriculum experts emphasized field-based experiences. Dewey, (1904) was an early advocate of this type of experience and promoted the idea with laboratory schools. Orlosky (1976) and Goodlad (1999) stressed the same method. The guidelines for NCATE 2000 also support field-based experiences for the pre-service teacher.

The inclusion of ethics/moral topics in curriculum course reaches its first challenge when with the concern of whose values are to be taught. Campbell (1997) wrote,

> "To understand the moral and ethical complexities of the value dimensions of teaching, student teachers should address and explore significant educational issues and experiences not simply from their own subjective perspectives and opinions but from an enlightened grounding in philosophical principles, theoretical positions, and conceptual frames comprising the foundations of educational thought. Self-awareness and understanding are important to the examination of the ethical implications of teaching. (p. 257)."

Planning the content and delivery of subject matter is a critical component of curriculum. Several models of lesson plans, such as those by Hunter, Gagne, and Rosenshine, exist (Reyes, 1990). It appears that the seven step model developed by Madeline Hunter (1989, 1990, 1991; Wolfe, 1998) fits the Florida Beginning Teacher program best. Manatee, Hillsbourgh, and several other local school districts adopted this model.

Interdisciplinary/integrated curriculum receives great deal of emphasis within the K-12 school systems. Yet within the higher education system this idea meets with turf guarding, entrenched departments, time, and money. Strawderman and Lindsey (1995) explained:

> The barriers to high education faculty working together to plan and teach are similar to those described by experienced classroom teachers working in inclusive school environments: lack of planning time, lack of knowledge about each other's discipline, and the content demands of specific courses. The attitudes and perceptions of many professors about inclusion such as their lack of faith in the feasibility of teaching all students in regular education classrooms can also be a barrier (p. 96).

Mason (1996) discusses both the potential and problems of integrated curricula. If higher education faculty is suppose to model practices for pre-service teachers, it seems a contradiction to avoid interdisciplinary teaching.

Constructivism is a topic that appears frequently in curriculum journals, but it is rarely addressed as a part of pre-service teacher education. McKeown and Beck (1999) wrote, "Although contructivism sounds deceptively simple in theory, many teachers encounter obstacles in creating constructivist classrooms. This constructivist approach to teaching literature gets students to do the talking and the thinking (p. 25.)." Practical suggestions for implementing constructivism into the curriculum are offered by King (1994) and Glatthorn (1994).

Increasingly, new teachers entering the K-12 classroom encounter post modernism/chaos theory in action. Because this topic is not taught in pre-service teacher education curriculum courses, the new teachers perceive it as a misconnect between the theories of higher education and the practicalities of "real" schooling. Doll, W. Jr. (1993) is a leader in post modernism with a design for curriculum that cites four criteria: richness, recursion, relations, and rigor. The topic has been addressed in several articles and books (Hunkins and Hammill, (1996); Macpherson, 1995; Iannone, 1995; Wiles, 1999).

At the present time standards captivate the primary position in curriculum. Candidates at NCATE-accredited schools of education in the new millennium will experience a focus on performance unlike any seen by candidates in the 20th century, according to Mr. Wise and Ms. Leibbrand. Subject-matter knowledge alone is not enough to ensure effective teaching (Wise and Leibbrand, 2000). Standards stir strong emotions among teachers, administrators, politicians, and students (Pipho, 2000; Wraga, 1999; and Brady, 2000).

The dilemmas facing curriculum education in the twenty-first century pose real challenges. A few solid suggestions emerge. Glatthorn (1988, 1999) developed a model of curriculum alignment and standards-based reform. Womak (1989) offered an individualized instruction model. Kaywell and Caroll (1988) identified five new imperatives for the twenty-first century: first, linking of all things on earth, and then,

recognizing that all people of the world are its stewards. Third, "Critical thinking, information usage, and problem-solving skills are now emphasized in all subject areas (p.13). Fourth, "...citizens of a dynamic world must take responsibility for their own learning (p. 13). Lastly, there is the study of aesthetics.

> Curriculum courses in the twenty-first century must change and adapt to the needs of the higher education system, the faculty, pre-service teachers, and the children they will serve. Both structure and flexibility demand a place in curriculum courses.

IV. Methods

The researchers developed a set methods based on a strong triangulation for the study. Surveys were given to students currently enrolled in the curriculum course for both the Fall and Spring Semesters on all four campuses. The faculty teaching the course as well as the entire faculty of the college of education were given a similar survey. Oral interviews were conducted with the College of Education administrators and the department chairs. Experts in the field of Curriculum were sent written interview questions. Regional administrators and teachers of the schools that hire the College of Education graduates were surveyed also. Course syllabi and textbooks were analyzed. These methods produced over 20,000 pieces of data.

The foundation of this study was the department syllabus that Dr. Daniel Purdom revised in December, 1998. This syllabus has six course goals:

(A) Students will develop an attitude of skeptical reflection when considering proposals and issues relative to curriculum and instruction.

(B) Students will think critically about the curriculum and instruction of schools in relation to the broader purposes/functions of schooling within a democratic and pluralistic society.

(C) Students will develop knowledge of key concepts, principles, and issues in the field of curriculum and instruction.

(D) Students will develop knowledge of curricular and instructional alternatives and understand how differences in values and belief are related to alternative approaches to schooling.

(E) Students will develop skills which are necessary for planning, presenting, and evaluating curriculum.

(F) Students will evaluate their own approach to curriculum and instruction and be interested in exploring other possibilities.

The following types of data were collected:

Type of Data	Date	Source
Survey of Course Objectives	12/99	Students in EDG 4620
Survey of Course Objectives	3/00	Students in EDG 4620
Survey of Course Objectives	5/00	College of Education Faculty who instruct Pre-service teachers.
Oral Interviews	2/00	College of Education Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, Program, Program Coordinators, Leadership Development Department members.
Rubric and analysis of syllabi	1/00	College of Education, Leadership Development Department.
Rubric and analysis of supplemental materials	3/00	College of Education, Leadership Development Department, supplemental materials.
Rubric and analysis of textbooks	5/00	Textbooks (12).
Review of the literature	5/00	ERIC and bibliographies.
Survey of Course Objectives	5/00	Curriculum Experts
Survey of Course Objectives	5/00	School District Curriculum Specialists, Administrators, Teachers (12 school districts).
Analysis	6/00	Surveys of Course Objectives.
Analysis of data sources	6/00	All other data.

V. Findings

A. Survey of Course Objectives, December 1999

Two hundred twenty-three students (223) who were enrolled in EDG 4620 were surveyed anonymously in December of 1999. The survey consisted of 31 possible course objectives, and students were asked to rate the importance of these objectives for a future career in education using a Likert format with five being excellent to one being poor.

The mean from all student responses ranged between four and five indicating that students felt all of the course objectives given were relatively important to their future careers in education. The highest five objectives were:

1. Seventy-four percent of students surveyed felt that it is important to "be able to write a lesson plan that includes objectives, content, activities, materials, and diagnosis."
2. Sixty-eight percent of students surveyed felt that it is important to:
   a) "be able to develop and apply learning activities that foster creativity and problem solving,"
   b) "be able to explain the impact of teacher attitude on student behavior and student achievement,"
   c) "be able to apply knowledge of learning styles (strategies for use of multiple stimuli) to lesson planning and presentation.
3. Sixty-five percent of students surveyed felt that it is important to "be able to apply knowledge of effective teaching practices when planning and presenting lessons."

B. Survey of Course Objectives, March 2000.

Four hundred eight students (408) who were enrolled in EDG 4620 were surveyed anonymously in March of 2000. The same survey was used.

With the exception of one objective, the mean from all student responses ranged between four and five indicating that students felt almost all of the course objectives given were relatively important their future careers in education. The exception was a mean of three given to the objective "be able to apply outcomes of Florida School Law and court case precedent to classroom teaching."

This exception should not cause alarm for two reasons. First, a mean of three ranks a "good" indicating average, and second, most professors typically teach school law topics at the end of the term.

Four of the five highest objectives from the December survey remain the highest for the March survey. The top five objectives were:

1. Sixty-three percent of students surveyed felt that it is important to:
   a) "be able to apply knowledge of effective teaching practices when planning and presenting lessons,"
   b) "be able to write a lesson plan that includes objectives, content, activities, materials, and diagnosis."
2. Fifty-seven percent of students surveyed felt that it is important to "be able to develop and apply learning activities, which foster creativity and problem solving."
3. Fifty-six percent of students surveyed felt that it is important to "be able to explain the impact of teacher attitude on student behavior and student achievement."
4. Fifty-one percent of students surveyed felt that it is important to:
   a) "be able to devise an effective teaching strategy based upon a model of student participation (cooperative learning),"
   b) "be able to develop skills which are necessary for analyzing, designing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum.
5. Fifty percent of students surveyed felt that it is important to "be able to apply knowledge of learning styles (strategies for use of multiple stimuli) to lesson planning and presentation."

C. Survey of Course Objectives – College of Education Faculty

A web-based survey was sent to all College of Education faculty in April of 2000. The survey consisted of 31 possible course objectives, and faculty were asked to "help us prioritize our content by thinking about what is taught in your undergraduate course and by thinking about what a preservice teacher needs to know to prepare for a future career in education." Faculty were asked to use a Likert format with five being excellent to one being poor. Besides the 31 possible course objectives faculty were also asked to answer three open-ended questions.

Although there are 200 plus College of Education faculty, only 24 responded to a web based survey. Due to the poor return rate, the strategy was revised. Hard copies of the same survey were sent to a select group (30) of the College of Education faculty who instruct pre-service teachers. Seventeen (17) responded.

The course objectives part of the survey were analyzed, and the mean from most faculty responses ranged between four and five indicating that faculty felt that most of the course objectives given were relatively important to pre-service teachers' future careers in education. The highest four objectives were:

1. Seventy-six percent of faculty surveyed felt that it is important to:
   a) "be able to apply knowledge of effective teaching practices when planning and presenting lessons.
   b) "be able to develop and apply learning activities that foster creativity and problem solving."
   c) "be able to devise an effective teaching strategy based upon a model of discussion (questioning)."
2. Seventy-one percent of faculty surveyed felt that it is important to "be able to explain the impact of teacher attitude on student behavior and student achievement."

A mean of three was given to three objectives from faculty. Remember that a mean of three ranks as "good" indicating average. They are:

1. "be able to distinguish among the four forms of knowledge (concept, rule, law, and value)."
2. "be able to identify different levels of curriculum decision-making and explain relationships of decisions made at various levels."
3. "be able to apply outcomes of Florida School Law and court case precedent to classroom teaching."

The open-ended questions of the survey were analyzed. The summary is given below:

Summary of Question 32 College of Education Faculty

#32 What do you think are the three most important hot topics or current trends related to the field of curriculum?

Goals	Hot Topics	Content Areas
B	Standards and accountability	3/6
D/C	Theories of curriculum	1/2
	Diversity/Student needs	
E	Technology	5

Summary of Question 33 and 34 College of Education Faculty

#33 What do you think the content of the course, EDG 4620, Curriculum and Instruction, should be in light of recent reform?

#34 What is the single most important thing that we can do in EDG 4620, Curriculum and Instruction, that could fundamentally improve teacher education?

Content	Methods	Both/Delivery
Standards 4	Apply knowledge 2	Integration/teaming 2
Accountability 4	Action research 2	
Balancing quality Instruction/testing 2	Reflection 2	
Diversity issues 7		
Technology 3		
Hidden curricula 2		
Lesson planning 2		
Creativity and Problem solving 3		
Different levels of Decision making 2		
Follow adopted Goals/use Resources 4		

D. Oral Interviews – Selected College of Education Administration and Faculty

Twenty-one College of Education faculty and administrators were interviewed in February and March of 2000. The interview format is attached as Appendix C. The results of the interviews have been transcribed and linked to the course goals:

Summary of Question 1 College of Education Oral Interviews

#1 What do you think are the three most important hot topics or current trends related to the field of curriculum?

Goals	Hot Topics	Content
B	Standards/ accountability	3/6
D/C	Theories of Curriculum	1/2
E	Technology	5
E/D/C	Instructional Approaches	5/4/2
B	Relationship with Community Student management	None (Link to Accomplished Practices)

Summary of Questions 2, 3, and 6 College of Education Oral Interviews

2 What do you think the content of the course, EDG 4620, Curriculum and Instruction should be in light of recent reform?

3 What methods of instruction do you think are best for this course?

6 What is the single most important thing that we can do in EDG 4620, Curriculum and Instruction, that could fundamentally improve teacher education?

Content	Methods	Both/Delivery
Theories of curriculum 2	Apply curriculum to subject areas (elementary) 5	Integration/Teaming 6
Broader purposes of schools within society 3	Apply curriculum to student, school & district needs 3	Link curriculum and classroom management 3
Learning styles 3	Variety of methods 3	Curriculum & Methods 1
Lesson plans & Long range curriculum development 4	Concrete and hands-on (case studies?) 2	Technology 4
Reform/Governance 6 Accountability/standards/ School choice	Modeling 10	Focus on a few key objectives 1
Effective teaching methods 3	Practical/pragmatic 9	Thematic/Interdisciplinary
Thematic/ Interdisciplinary 2	Action-based research 4	Communication with Professors in other areas 2
Accomplished practices (Florida and NCATE) 2	One theme that runs through the course 1	Common readings and Experiences 1
Decision making 1	Thematic/ Interdisciplinary 1	Tied to field experience 1
Technology 4	Active learning: (role playing, cooperative learning) 1	Bring in master teachers from schools 1
Assessment 3	Reflection 1	
Inclusion 1	Constructivism 3	
History of curriculum 2		
Exposure to recent research 2		
Florida performance Measurement system 1		
Values and ethics 1		
Objectives 1		

Summary of Questions 4 College of Education Oral Interviews

#4 If EDG 4620 was merged with another required course, what do you think would be the best fit?

1. Assign Curriculum & Instruction faculty to method course 3
2. Social foundations 4
3. Psychological Foundations 3
4. Measurement 5
5. Methods: inbed it with no Curriculum & Instruction faculty 2
6. Methods & Curriculum with field experience 3
7. Measurement, Methods and Curriculum & Instruction (new course) 1
8. Action based research (new course) 1
9. Merger of Social, Psychological, Measurement with Curriculum & Instruction to create a new course with field experiences over three semesters 1
10. Maintain Curriculum & Instruction as a separate course 1

In general, the faculty, including some who currently teach EDG 4620, favored merger of EDG 4620 with another course/courses. Only one wanted to maintain EDG 4620, Curriculum and Instruction as a separate course. The most frequently suggested link (5) was with measurement. Social Foundations was second with four (4). Nine responses recommended some type of combination with a methods course. Combining responses for a merger of Social, Psychological, Measurement, and Curriculum & Instruction or creation of a new course, the total ranks the highest at fifteen (15).

Summary of Questions 5 College of Education Oral Interviews

#5 In your opinion, how viable is it for some of the required courses to be taught using a model of interdisciplinary or thematic instruction?

Viable:	15
Not Viable	2
It depends	2

E. Rubric and Analysis of Syllabi – Leadership Development Department
In December 1998, Dr. Daniel Purdom identified six major areas of study common to all sections of EDG 4620. These areas are:

1. Definitions of curriculum
2. Conceptions of curriculum
3. The purposes of schooling
4. The content of curriculum
5. Instructional strategies
6. The governance of schooling

Syllabi were collected from ten faculty who currently teach EDG 4620. Of those, five were full time faculty and five were adjunct faculty. Points were given by topics being covered well (2), somewhat (1), and topics not covered (0).

The analysis showed that the six major content areas from the department syllabus were covered well by faculty syllabi. In addition, school reform, classroom management, real life skills and LEP strategies were covered well by most faculty syllabi. Some faculty syllabi also included technology skills and ESE strategies.

F. Rubric and analysis of supplemental materials - Leadership Development Department

Supplemental materials were collected from five faculty who currently teach EDG 4620. Of those, two were full time faculty and three were adjunct faculty. Ninety-seven (97) separate items/pieces were identified. These ninety-seven supplemental materials were analyzed to determine a connection/link with the six (6) primary course goals of EDG 4620.

Summary of Analysis of Supplemental Materials

Goal	# of Materials
A	22
B	25
C	15
D	12
E	18
F	1
Useful Materials	4

G. Rubric and analysis of textbooks.

EDG 4620: Curriculum and Instruction was designed originally without the recommendation of a particular textbook. Faculty and adjuncts have assembled materials into packets published by Pro Copy, and some instructors have developed classes based on a textbook. In the process of analyzing EDG 4620, the researchers decided it was necessary to analyze several textbooks regarding their relationship to the six course goals and the content categories identified by Drs. Hosack-Curlin and Purdom (1993).

Twelve textbooks were selected. On May 5, 2000 a letter was sent to the faculty and adjuncts teaching EDG 4620 that informed them of the process and requested input. Only Dr. William Benjamin responded. He suggested that the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) curriculum books merited examination. Two ASCD books by Dr. Allan Glatthorn were added to the list.

The six content areas of EDG 4620 plus additional topics that match the categories from the rubric of department syllabi formed thirteen categories for analysis of textbooks. The categories were:

1. Definition of curriculum
2. Philosophies
3. Aims, Goals, Objectives
4. Instructional strategies
5. Governance of schooling
6. Reform
7. Classroom management
8. Technology skills
9. Real life skills
10. LEP strategies
11. ESE strategies
12. Legal issues
13. Case Studies

Points were given by topics being covered well (2), topics covered somewhat (1), and topics not covered (0). The analysis showed:

	Text	Value
1.	Glatthorn, A. A. (1998). Performance assessment and standards-based curricula: The achievement cycle. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.	10
2.	Glatthorn, A. A. (1999). Performance standards authentic learning. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.	9
3.	Morrison, G. S. (1997). Teaching in America. Boston: Allyn and Bacon	21
4.	Oliva, P. F. (1997). Developing the Curriculum. (4th.). New York: Longman	13
5.	Ornstein, A. C., & Behar-Horenstein, L. S., (1999). Contemporary issues in curriculum. (2nd.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.	12
6.	Ornstein, A. C. & Hunkins, F. P. (1998). Curriculum: foundation, principles, and issues. (3rd.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.	10
7.	Parkay, F. W. & Hass,G. (2000). Curriculum planning: A contemporary approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.	18
8.	Passe, J. (1999) Elementary school curriculum. Boston: McGraw-Hill.	11
9.	Pinar, W. (1998). Curriculum: towards new identities. New York: Garland	6
10.	Queen, J. (1999). Curriculum Practice. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall	12
11.	Ryan, K. & Cooper, J. (1998). Those Who Can, Teach. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.	18
12.	Sowell, E. (1996). Curriculum: An integrative Introduction	6
13.	Wiles, J. (1999). Curriculum essentials. Boston: Allyn & Bacon	16
14.	Wiles, J. Bondi, J. (1998). Curriculum development. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall	12

Observations about textbooks:

1 & 2. Glatthorn: Both books by this author are excellent sources for the instructors of EDG 4620. His use of charts and diagrams is very helpful. The text, however, is designed for a Curriculum Specialist and not for an undergraduate/pre-service student. The Standards-Based Curricula contains helpful material for specific subject areas.

3. Morrison: A very good introductory text. The focus is on "Introduction to Education." It lacks curriculum theory.

4. Oliva: An outstanding text on the subject of curriculum! Misses on topics that beginning teachers need. Contains many Florida examples.

5. Ornstein & Behar-Horenstein: One (1) case study for each part; few charts; geared to graduate level students and principals

6. Ornstein & Hunkins: Graduate level. Theory laden. It has few charts.

7. Parkay: Super for Introduction to Education course. Easy to read. Great examples. Lacks curriculum theory and basics.

8. Passe: Very good definition of curriculum. Discusses specific subject areas. Especially good for elementary education.

9. Pinar: Issue oriented. Series of articles that focus on certain topics. Best suited for the graduate level.

10. Queen: Middle school focuses. Contains valuable material. Graduate/Specialist level.

11. Ryan & Cooper: High quality text. Excellent case studies and explanation of philosophies. Filled with charts and diagrams. It was designed for an introduction to education class, and Hillsborough Community College uses it for this purpose.

12. Sowell: Graduate level, very good curriculum evaluation. Explains change in relationship to curriculum well.

13. Wiles: Recent work. It has organizational problems. More of a reference tool. It covers many of the EDG 4620 topics. No case studies.

14. Wiles & Bondi: Excellent "how to" for the practitioner. Solid on history, theory, and philosophy. No case studies. Few charts or diagrams. Serves the needs of the graduate student and the practitioner better than the pre-service teacher.

Summary of textbook analysis:

The wide ranging goals and objectives of EDG 4620: Curriculum and Instruction present a challenge when one is analyzing textbooks that might be appropriate for the class. The analysis revealed a broad range of textbooks from the "Introduction to Education" to the graduate level. No single textbook wholly addressed the goals and objectives of EDG 4620.

The three textbooks that ranked the highest—Morrison, Parkay, and Ryan & Cooper, are designed for Introduction to Education classes. They have been used at the area's community college, and many students have used the texts before entering EDG 4620. During the College of Education faculty interviews, several professors expressed objections to use of "Introduction to Education" textbooks for EDG 4620. With these points in mind, none of the three highest ranking textbooks from the analysis can be recommended as a course book for EDG 4620. Several of the remaining textbooks addressed the needs of graduate students or practitioners. Of these, Wiles' book ranked the highest. Following closely were the textbooks by Wiles & Bondi, Ornstein & Behar-Horenstein, and Queen. None of these, however, heartily full-filled the course requirements of EDG 4620. Following the careful analysis of the fourteen textbooks, no single book can be recommended to faculty for the students of EDG 4620. Any textbook needs to be supplemented with materials appropriate to the goals and objectives of EDG 4620.

H. Experts

To select experts in the field of curriculum, contacts (Professors of Curriculum and Curriculum Teachers Network) were established during the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) Annual Conference in New Orleans, March 2000. The survey followed the format used for the oral interviews of the USF deans and faculty with the exception of question #4.The question stated, "If EDG 4620 was merged with another course, what do you think would be the best fit?" This question was removed because the experts would not be familiar with the content of other USF courses. Thirty- four surveys were mailed. Fifteen surveys were returned. One was blank, and the returnee noted that she was retired. The fourteen surveys resulted in a forty-two percent (42%) response rate.

Summary of Question 1 from the Experts' surveys

#1 What do you think are the three most important hot topics or current trends related to the field of curriculum?

Hot Topics	# of Ratings
Standards/Accountability	14
Relationship with the Community	7
Instructional Approaches	4
Common Values of a Pluralistic Society	4
Technology	3
Theories of Curriculum	2
Student Management	2

#2 What do you think the content of a general Curriculum and Instruction course for pre-service teachers should be in light of recent reform or hot topic listed in question #1?

1. Teach pre-service teachers the basics principles of Curriculum
2. Curriculum development/alignment/matrix
3. How to lessen damaging effect on K-12 students of prevailing testing policies.
4. History of Curriculum

#3 What method or method of instruction do you think are the best for this course?

1. A wide variety of methods
2. Methods that are contextually appropriate
3. Problem-based learning/case studies/field based
4. Active learning
5. Methods that involve students in reflection on their own educational experiences

#4 In your opinion, how viable is it for some of the required courses to be taught using a model of interdisciplinary or thematic instruction?

Viable	9
Not Viable	0
It depends	5

Summary of Question from Faculty and Experts

In your opinion, how viable is it for some of the required courses to be taught using a model of interdisciplinary or thematic instruction?

CATERGORIES	FACULTY	EXPERTS
Viable:	15	10
Not Viable:	2	
It depends:	2	4

Summary from Faculty Interviews:

Doable; issue of size, complexity and use of faculty time

Team-taught; we need to move in that direction. Not all or nothing; Create a formula. Maintain some autonomy.

Where we need to go without loosing the content. Show kids how content function in the real world.

Note: Those who did not approve fail to add any comments/reasons for their answer.

Comments from Experts' Responses:

Very! These courses have a 19th Century flavor; they would come to life in a thematic format.

This is only as viable as the professor who is assigned to teach these courses are willing to make interdisciplinary methods work.

Intellectually, this is both viable and required in today's learning world. Institutionally (and politically), it's a struggle that must be fought daily.

Great idea! It is very difficult to get staff that can handle it, or to set up a team to teach it. Load time and planning time a problem.

Note: Those who did not approve expressed a desire for more information in order to make a decision.

I. School District Curriculum Specialists, Administrators, and Teachers

These Florida school districts were surveyed in May, 2000: Hillsborough, Pinellas, Pasco, Polk, Sarasota, Charlotte, Citrus, Hardee, Manatee, Highlands, DeSoto, and Hernando. For all of the above districts except for Hardee and DeSoto, nine schools (three at each level – elementary, middle, and high) were randomly selected for surveying. For Hardee and DeSoto, five schools were randomly selected. Each school was sent three surveys. The principal was asked to complete the survey and asked to distribute the remaining two surveys to his/her best two teachers. In addition, at least one district administrator whose primary responsibility is "curriculum" per district was also sent a survey.

The survey is attached in Appendix G. The survey consisted of 31 possible course objectives, and the practitioners were asked to "help us prioritize' our content by thinking about what a pre-service teacher needs to know to prepare for a future career in education" by using a Likert format. They were also asked to answer three open-ended questions.

Administrator Responses

Of the 110 surveys sent out to administrators, 67 were returned (61% return rate). The mean from all administrator responses ranged between four and five indicating that they felt that all of the course objectives given were relatively important to pre-service teachers. The highest six objectives were:

1. Eighty-two percent of administrators surveyed felt that it is important to "be able to apply knowledge of effective teaching practices when planning and presenting lessons."
2. Seventy-nine percent of administrators surveyed felt that it is important to "be able to explain the impact of teacher attitude on student behavior and achievement."
3. Seventy-six percent of administrators surveyed felt that it is important to "be able to develop and apply learning activities that foster creativity and problem solving."
4. Seventy-five percent of administrators surveyed felt that it is important to "be able to identify ethical teacher behaviors."
5. Seventy-one percent of administrators surveyed felt that it is important to:
   a) "be able to devise an effective teaching strategy based upon a model of student participation (cooperative learning)."
   b) "be able to apply knowledge of learning styles (strategies for use of multiple stimuli) to lesson planning and presentation."

The open-ended questions of the survey were analyzed. The summary is given below:

Summary of Question 32 Administrators and Curriculum Specialists

Question 32 What do you think are the three most important hot topics Or current trends related to the field of curriculum?

Goals	Hot Topics	Content Areas
B	Standards and accountability	3/6
B	High Stakes Testing	3/6
E	Technology	5
D, E, F	Integration of Subjects	5

Summary of Questions 33 and 34 Administrators and Curriculum Specialists

Question 33 What do you think the content of the course, EDG 4620, Curriculum and Instruction, should be in light of recent reform?

Question 34 What is the single most important thing that we can do in EDG 4620, Curriculum and Instruction, that could fundamentally improve teacher education?

Content	Methods	Both/Delivery
Standards 16	Practical experiences and Applying knowledge 14	Integration of subjects 14
High stakes testing And accountability 15		Integration of technology 14
Meet individual Needs of students 9		
Presentation of subject Matter/delivery 8		
Aligning teaching strategies With student outcomes 8		
Classroom Management 10		
Best practices 12		
Inclusion 11		
Multiculturalism 7		
Variety of instructional Methods 7		
Correlate instruction to Standards 17		

Teacher Responses

Of the 220 surveys sent out to teachers, 69 were returned (31% return rate). With the exception of three objectives, the mean from all teacher responses ranged between four and five indicating that they felt that almost all of the course objectives given were relatively important to pre-service teachers. The highest five objectives were:

1. Eighty-two percent of teachers surveyed felt that it is important to "be able to apply knowledge of effective teaching practices when planning and presenting lessons."
2. Seventy-nine percent of teachers surveyed felt that it is important to "be able to develop and apply learning activities that foster creativity and problem solving."
3. Seventy-six percent of teachers surveyed felt that it is important to "be able to explain the impact of teacher attitude on student behavior and achievement."
4. Seventy-one percent of teachers surveyed felt that it is important to:
   a) "be able to devise an effective teaching strategy based upon a model of direct instruction (introduction, content, and follow up)."
   b) "be able to apply methods of alternative assessment (portfolio, individual conferencing, group interaction, presentations, and research reports)."

A mean of three was given to three objectives from the teachers. Remember that a mean of three ranks as "good" indicating average. They are:

1. "be able to identify current educational reform strategies at the federal, state, and district levels."
2. "be able to identify different levels of curriculum decision-making and explain relationships of decisions made at various levels."
3. "be able to explain the outcomes of Florida School Law and court case precedent to classroom teaching."

The open-ended questions of the survey were analyzed. The summary is given below:

Summary of Question 32 Teachers

Question 32 What do you think are the three most important hot topics Or current trends related to the field of curriculum?

Goals	Hot Topics	Content Areas
B	Standards and accountability	3/6
B	High Stakes Testing	3/6
E	Technology	5
	Inclusion	
D, E, F	Integration of Subjects	5

Summary of Questions 33 and 34 Teachers

Question 33 What do you think the content of the course, EDG 4620, Curriculum and Instruction, should be in light of recent reform?

Question 34 What is the single most important thing that we can do in EDG 4620, Curriculum and Instruction, that could fundamentally improve teacher education?

Content	Methods	Both/Delivery
Standards 25	Practical experiences/apply Knowledge 26	Integration of Technology 21
Testing/Account. 34		Integration of Subjects 15
Inclusion 22		Alternative Assessment 7
Multiculturalism 8		
Variety of instructional Methods 16		
Critical Thinking and Problem Solving 9		
Classroom Management 14		
Correlate instruction to Standards/testing 24		
Best practices 7		
Cooperative learning 5		

V. Conclusions

A content matrix was developed using all the data sources (syllabi, texts, supplemental materials, experts, College of Education survey, College of Education interview, school teacher survey, school administrator survey, student survey in December, student survey in March) plus information from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Florida Department of Education Teacher Preparation Program Committee – Recommendations for Teacher Preparation, Florida Department of Education – Educator Accomplished Practices Pre-professional Competencies and the University of South Florida College of Education Mission and Philosophy.

The categories of the content matrix were based on the syllabi and textbook rubric. Additional categories were added when clusters emerged from the data.

Categories by source were marked in two ways. First, for open-ended data (syllabi, texts, supplemental materials, experts, interviews, and the open-ended questions of surveys) categories were marked if more than half of the sample indicated a preference. Second, for objective surveys, categories were marked for the top five to seven objectives.

To determine the top priorities across all data sources, the following procedures were applied. For each category, marks were summed across all data sources. Second, these amounts were averaged, and the mean was 3.88. The categories that had four (4) or more marks were labeled as a priority.

The content matrix is given on the next two pages:

	Syllabi	Texts	Supple. Mat.	Expert	COE Survey	COE Interv.	School Teacher	School Adm.	Student Dec.	Student March	Nation (ncate)
Standards				X	X	X	X	X			X
Reform	X	X	X								
Account.					X	X	X	X			X
Assess.						X	X				
Theories Curr.	X	X	X			X				X	X
Philos.	X	X	X								
Tech. Resource						X					
Tech. Infusion					X	X	X	X			X
Reflect-ion											
Best Practices								X	X	X	
Integrate subjects			X				X	X			
Instr. Strategies	X		X			X					
Coop. Learning								X		X	
Direct Instr.							X				
Modeling											X
Practical Expers.	X						X	X			X
Present. Subj.	X		X		X		X	X			
Planning	X				X		X	X	X	X	
Teaching Styles		X						X	X	X	
Use of Questions					X						
Creative Prob. Solve					X		X	X	X		
Corr. Instr. to Standards							X	X			
ESOL											X
	Syllabi	Texts	Supple. Mat.	Expert	COE Survey	COE Interv.	School Teacher	School Adm.	Student Dec.	Student March	Nation (ncate)
Inclusion							X				X
Student Needs					X	X			X		X
Relates to students-Teacher attitude					X		X	X	X	X	
Ethics								X			
School Safety											
Govern.	X		X								
Cont. Improv.											
Comm. Collabor.				X							

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VI. Recommendations

The following are options to change the course:

A. EDG 4620, Curriculum and Instruction should remain an independent course with field experience added.

B. EDG 4620, Curriculum and Instruction should be integrated with Measurement and a field experience over one semester to create a four-hour course.

C. EDG 4620, Curriculum and Instruction should be integrated with Social Foundations, Psychological Foundations, Measurement, and a field experience over three semesters.

EDG 4620, Curriculum and Instruction - independent course with field experience

1. Need to form a department committee to re-design the course using the information from this study.
2. Need to rewrite the primary goals of the course using the priorities identified from the content matrix. These areas should be addressed:
   a) standards
   b) reform
   c) accountability
   d) assessment
   e) theories of curriculum
   f) technological infusion
   g) integration of subjects
   h) instructional strategies
   i) practical experience
   j) presentation of subject matter
   k) planning
   l) teaching and learning styles
   m) creativity and problem solving
   n) classroom management
   o) student needs (diversity issues)
   p) teacher attitude toward students (relationships with students).
3. Need to monitor the emphasis of the Florida Teacher Certification Examination (FTCE). As of 8-5-00, the emphasis of the test is the Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS). EDG 4620 should continue to teach Domain 4.0, Presentation of Subject Matter of FPMS and other information from FPMS.
4. Continue teaching the ESOL components designed for the department syllabus (1998).

5. Decide how post modernism and constructivism will be addressed in the course .
6. Needs to be a coordinator for the course who will receive some kind of course release for this assignment.
7. Needs to be a small but common core of staff that teach the course.
8. The core of staff that teach the course should be "assigned" to collaborate with other departments.
9. Needs to be training for all staff concerning new course format/content.
10. Needs to be required training for new faculty prior to teaching the course.
11. Needs to greater cohesion among the staff who teach the course.
12. Needs to be more consistency across sections of the course so that students receive the same content and similar learning experiences.
13. Needs to be an agreed upon common lesson plan format across sections of the course.
14. Need to continue the search for a common textbook.
15. Need to focus on strategies (questioning, learning styles, critical thinking, cooperative learning, graphic organizers, etc…) instead of activities (games, handouts, etc…).

EDG 4620, Curriculum and Instruction - integrated with Measurement and a field experience over one semester – four hour course.

1. Team teach this class with two instructors.
2. Topics are interwoven (writing behavioral objectives, developing rubrics, assessment for lesson plans and units) and applied to the field.
3. Search for a text that integrates Measurement and Curriculum and Instruction.

EDG 4620, Curriculum and Instruction - integrated with Social Foundations, Psychological Foundations, Measurement, and a field experience over three semesters.

1. Team teach this class with four instructors.
2. Larger class sizes to accommodate.
3. Topics are interwoven so that overlaps are eliminated.
4. Demonstrate inter-relatedness and connectiveness of research and topics across areas.
5. Search for texts that integrate topics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bauer, N. (1990). Pedagogy and the "Other" Dimension of Teacher Preparation: A trend and a Response. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 323 176.

Brady, M. (2000). The standards juggernaut. Phi Delta Kappan, 81, (9) 648-657.

Cambell, E. (1997). Connecting the ethics of teaching and moral education. Journal of Teacher Education, 48, (4) 255-263.

Dewey, J. (1904). The relation of theory to practice in education. In C. A. McMurry (ed.), The relation of theory to practice in the education of teachers. Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Glatthorn, A. (1988). A curriculum for the twenty-first century. The Clearing House, 62, (1) 7-10.

Glatthorn, A. (1994). Constructivism: Implications for curriculum. International Journal of Educational Reform,3, (4) 449-55.

Glatthorn, A. (1999). Curriculum alignment revisited. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 15, (1) 26-34.

Goodlad, J. (1999). Whither schools of education? Journal of Teacher Education, 50, (5) 325-337.

Hunkins, F. and Hammill, P. (1996). Beyond Tyler and Taba: Reconceptualizing the curriculum process. Peabody Journal of Education, 69, (3) 4-18.

Hunter, M. (1991). Generic Lesson design: The case for. Science Teacher, 58, (7) 26-28.

Hunter, M. (1989). Working with the exceptional student. B. C. Journal of Special Education, 13, (2) 147-50.

Iannone, R. (1995). Chaos theory and its implications for curriculum and teaching. Education, 115, (4) 541-547.

Kaywell, J. and Carroll, R. (1988). Education in Year 2000: Possible and preferable futures. The Clearing House, 62, (1) 11-13.

King, A. (1994). Guiding knowledge construction in the classroom; Effects of teaching children how to question and how to explain. American Educational Research Journal,31, (2) 338-368.

. McKeown, M. and Beck, I. (1999). Getting the discussion started. Educational Leadership,57, (3) 25-28.

Macpherson, E. (1995). Chaos in the curriculum. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 27, (3) 263-279

Mason, T. (1996). Integrated curricula: Potential and problems. Journal of Teacher Education, 47, (4) 263-270.

Orlosky, D., Cooper, J. et al, (1976). The teaching of teaching. Unpublished report of a course/conference organized by the Welsh Education Office/Department of Education and Science held at the City of Cardiff College of Education, 5-9 July, 1976.

Reyes, D. (1990). Models of instruction: Some light on the model muddle. The Clearing House, 63, (5) 214-216

Pipho, C. (2000). The sting of high-stakes testing and accountability. Phi Delta Kappan, 81, (9) 645646.

Sardo-Brown, D. (1990). Experienced teachers' planning practices: A US survey. Journal of Education for Teaching, 16, (1) 57-71.

Strawderman, C. & Lindsey, P. (1995). Keeping up with the times: Reform in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 46, (2) 95-99.

Tanner, D. & Tanner, L. (1990). History of the School Curriculum. New York: Macmillan.

Tibbles, April et al (1991). National Middle School Association (NMSA) NCATE-Approved Curriculum Guidelines. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED360 076.

Tyler, R. (1981). Curriculum development since 1900. Educational Leadership, 38, (8) 598-601.

Wiles, J. (1999). Curriculum Essentials. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Wise, A. and Leibbrand, J. (2000). Standards and teacher quality: Entering the new millennium. Phi Delta Kappan, 81, (8) 612-616, 621.

Wolfe, P. (1998). Revisiting effective teaching. Educational Leadership, 56, (3) 61-64.

Womack, S. (1989). <odes of Instruction: Expository, demonstration, inquiry, individualized. The Clearing House, 62, (5) 205-210.

Wraga, W. (1999). The educational and political implications of curriculum alignment and standards-based reform. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 15, (1) 4-25.

ED 436 241

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The Process of Analyzing and Evaluating a College of Education Curriculum Course	
Author(s): Lynette J. Fields and Ann M. Lee	
Corporate Source: University of South Florida	Publication Date: June, 2000.

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Lynette J. Fields / Ann M. Lee	Printed Name/Position/Title: Lynette J. Fields / Ann M. Lee (Professor)
Organization/Address: USF St. Petersburg 140 Seventh Ave. S. St. Petersburg, FL 33701	Telephone: (727) 553-4059 FAX: (727) 553-4199
	E-Mail Address: Fields@tempest.coedu.usf.edu. Date: 10-3-03

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene OR 97403-5207
Attn: Acquisitions

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)